

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/582, 964	07/06/00	HOFFMAN	K THUR-001

HM12/0420

BOZICEVIC FIELD & FRANCIS  
200 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD  
SUITE 200  
MENLO PARK CA 94025

EXAMINER

TRavers, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 04/20/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. <b>09/582,964</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Hoffman et al</b>
	Examiner <b>RUSSELL TRAVERS</b>	Group Art Unit <b>1617</b>

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- This action is **FINAL**.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

#### Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- received.
- received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
- received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

#### Attachment(s)

- Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit:

Claims 1-25 are presented for examination.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, and thereby failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence or absence of working examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art

Art Unit:

7) the predictability of the art, and

8) the breadth of the claims.

Applicant fails to set forth the criteria that define "cell adhesion molecules", "cell adhesion molecule cleavage", "protease inhibitor", "tPA inhibitor", or "mimetics thereof". Additionally, Applicant fails to provide information allowing the skilled artisan to ascertain these compounds without undue experimentation. In the instant case, only a limited number of "cell adhesion molecules", "cell adhesion molecule cleavage", "protease inhibitor", "tPA inhibitor", or "mimetics thereof" examples are set forth, thereby failing to provide sufficient working examples. It is noted that these examples are neither exhaustive, nor define the class of compounds required. The pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. The instant claims read on all "cell adhesion molecules", "cell adhesion molecule cleavage", "protease inhibitor", "tPA inhibitor", or "mimetics thereof", necessitating an exhaustive search for the embodiments suitable to practice the claimed invention. Applicants fail to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

Art Unit:

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-25 are rendered indefinite by the phrases "cell adhesion molecules", "cell adhesion molecule cleavage", "protease inhibitor", "tPA inhibitor", or "mimetics thereof" and thereby failing to clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Criteria defining medicaments useful for as a "protease inhibitor", "tPA inhibitor", or "mimetics thereof" are not set forth in the specification, thereby failing to provide information defining the instant inventions metes and bounds. Additionally, the phrases, "cell adhesion molecules", "cell adhesion molecule cleavage" fails to clearly define the subject matter encompassed by the instant claims, thus, is properly rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit:

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Friedrich, Okajima et al, Veronesi et al and Pinsky et al, in view of Kazmirowski et al.

Friedrich, Okajima et al and Veronesi et al teach the claimed compounds as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. These medicament are taught as useful for treating neurological pathologies, to include seizures, motor functional disturbances, ischemia and trauma.

Claims 1-25, and the primary references, differ as to:

- 1) the recitation of Applicants hypothesized mechanism by which the therapeutic method is effected, and
- 2) teaching anti-protease compounds as providing therapy for neuropathic conditions; or the claimed compounds as possessing various anti-protease activity.

The instant claims are directed to treating various neuro-pathologies, vis-a-vis effecting various neural biochemical pathways with old and well known compounds. Arguments that Applicant's claims are not directed to the old and well known ultimate utility for this compound are not probative. It is well settled patent law that mode of action elucidation fails to impart patentable moment to otherwise old and obvious subject matter. Applicant's attention is directed to In re Swinehart, (169 USPQ 226 at

Art Unit:

229) where the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals stated "is elementary that the mere recitation of a newly discovered function or property, inherently possessed by things in the prior art, does not cause a claim drawn to those things to distinguish over the prior art.". Additionally, where the Patent Office has reason to believe that a functional limitation asserted to be critical for establishing novelty in the claimed subject matter, may in fact be an inherent characteristic of the prior art, it possesses the authority to require the applicant to prove that the subject matter shown to be in the prior art does not possess the characteristic, on which Applicant has relied. In the instant invention, the claims are directed to the ultimate utility set forth in the prior art, albeit distanced by various biochemical intermediates. The ultimate utility for the claimed compounds is old and well known, rendering the claimed subject matter obvious to the skilled artisan. It would follow therefore that the instant claims are properly rejected under 35 USC 103.

Pinsky et al teach compounds possessing anti-proteolytic activity as providing prophylaxis and therapy for various neuro-pathologies herein recited. Kazmirowski et al teach the claimed compounds as possessing irreversible protease inhibition for those proteolytic enzymes herein claimed. Possessing the Pinsky et al teaching, the skilled artisan would have seen as obvious, employment of the Kazmirowski et al enzyme inhibitors for those therapies taught by Pinsky et al.

Art Unit:

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Russell  
Travers at telephone number (703) 308-4603.



**Russell Travers**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**Art Unit 1617**